

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

BECKLEY DIVISION

LA SHAWN LEE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 5:06-0454
)	
JOHN DOE, Director,)	
Federal Bureau of Prisons, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

On June 12, 2006, Plaintiff,¹ acting *pro se* and formerly incarcerated at FCI Beckley in Beckley, West Virginia, filed his Complaint in this matter claiming entitlement to relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.² (Document No. 1.) Plaintiff names the following as Defendants: (1) John Doe, Director of Federal Bureau of Prisons; (2) John Doe, Regional Director; (3) Charles T. Felts, Warden; (4) Clinic Director; and (5) Sue Engles, Assistant Director. (*Id.*) Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution by failing to provide him with medical treatment. (Document No. 1.) Specifically, Plaintiff's Complaint states as follows:

All named Defendants have directly and/or indirectly through negligence and deliberate indifference acted to violate my Eight Amendment right to medical treatment and services by deprivation and depriving Plaintiff medical treatment.

¹ The Bureau of Prisons' Inmate Locator indicates that Petitioner was released from custody on November 8, 2007.

² Because Plaintiff is acting *pro se*, the documents which he has filed in this case are held to a less stringent standard than if they were prepared by a lawyer and therefore, they are construed liberally. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972).

I. Mitigating Fact:

Plaintiff Lee arrived at FCI Beckley on or about January 2006, and was never given a physical examination upon arrival nor treatment of injury of groin and lower back.

II. Gross Malfeasance:

The Director, Regional Director, and Warden Felts acted in co-hoots with Associate Warden and medical Staff to deprive medical treatment to Plaintiff Lee and other inmates similarly situated in violation of the Eighth Amendment, and this is not an isolated incident, but rather normal practices.

(Id., pp. 2 - 3.) Plaintiff requests the following relief: (1) “Court order issued granting compensatory damages in the amount of \$200,000.00 dollars;” (2) “Court order issued granting punitive damages in the amount of \$150,000.00 dollars;” and (3) “Court order issued granting declaratory judgment and injunctive relief.” (Id., p. 4.)

THE STANDARD

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the Court is required to screen each case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. On screening, the Court must recommend dismissal of the case if the complaint is frivolous, malicious or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. A “frivolous” complaint is one which is based upon an indisputably meritless legal theory. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 112 S.Ct. 1728, 118 L.Ed.2d 340 (1992). A “frivolous” claim lacks “an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 109 S.Ct. 1827, 1831 - 32, 104 L.Ed.2d 338 (1989). A claim lacks an arguable basis in law when it is “based on an indisputably meritless legal theory.” Id., 490 U.S. at 327, 109 S.Ct. at 1833. A claim lacks an arguable basis in fact when it describes “fantastic or delusional scenarios.” Id., 490 U.S. at 327 - 328, 109 S.Ct. at 1833. A complaint therefore fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted factually when it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him or

her to relief.

ANALYSIS

42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides a remedy for violations of all “rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws [of the United States].” Thus, Section 1983 provides a “broad remedy for violations of federally protected civil rights.” Monell v. Dep’t of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 685, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611 (1978). Generally speaking, to state and prevail upon a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a Plaintiff must prove that (1) a person acting under color of State law (2) committed an act which deprived him of an alleged right, privilege or immunity protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. Therefore, the actions and conduct of federal agencies, officers and employees are not actionable under Section 1983. See Gomez v. Toledo, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980)(a claim for relief under Section 1983 may be made only against persons who acted under color of state law). Rather, claims of personal liability for violations of constitutional rights may be maintained against individual federal officers and employees under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Federal Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971). Because the Defendants were acting under color of federal law, Plaintiff’s claims against them are not cognizable under Section 1983. The undersigned therefore will construe and consider Plaintiff’s claims under Bivens.

A Bivens action is a judicially created damages remedy which is designed to vindicate violations of constitutional rights by federal actors. See Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388, 395 -97, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971); See also Carlson v. Green, 446 U.S. 14, 100 S.Ct. 1468, 64 L.Ed.2d 15 (1980)(extending Bivens to Eighth Amendment claims); Davis v. Passman, 442 U.S. 228, 239 n. 18, 99 S.Ct. 2264, 2274 n. 18,

60 L.Ed.2d 846 (1979)(extending Bivens to allow citizen's recovery of damages resulting from a federal agent's violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.) A Bivens action is the federal counterpart of an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. An action for money damages may be brought against federal agents acting under the color of their authority for injuries caused by their unconstitutional conduct. Proof of causation between the official's conduct and the alleged injury is necessary for there to be liability. A plaintiff asserting a claim under Bivens must show the violation of a valid constitutional right by a person acting under color of federal law.³ The United States Supreme Court has held that an inmate may name a federal officer in an individual capacity as a defendant in alleging an Eighth Amendment constitutional violation pursuant to Bivens. See Wilson v. Seiter, 501 U.S. 294, 111 S.Ct. 2321, 115 L.Ed. 2d 171 (1991). However, Bivens claims are not actionable against the United States, federal agencies, or public officials acting in their official capacities. See FDIC v. Meyer, 510 U.S. 471, 475, 484-86, 114 S.Ct. 996, 127 L.Ed. 2d 308 (1994); Berger v. Pierce, 933 F.2d 393, 397 (6th Cir. 1991); Reingold v. Evers, 187 F.3d 348, 355

³ Inmates may file claims of liability against the United States under the FTCA but may not assert claims of personal liability against prison officials for violations of their constitutional rights. *Carlson v. Green*, 446 U.S. at 21-23, 100 S.Ct. at 1472 -74. By contrast, under *Bivens* inmates may assert claims of personal liability against individual prison officials for violations of their constitutional rights but may not assert claims against the government or prison officials in their official capacities. The Supreme Court held in *Carlson*, 446 U.S. at 18 - 21, 100 S.Ct. at 1471-72, that an inmate could pursue a *Bivens* action independent of a FTCA action. The Court found that Congress did not intend to pre-empt a *Bivens* remedy when it enacted the FTCA. *Id.* The Court noted that the legislative history of the FTCA "made it crystal clear that Congress views FTCA and *Bivens* as parallel, complementary causes of action." *Id.*, 446 U.S. at 19 - 20, 100 S.Ct. at 1471 -72. Relying upon *Carlson*, the Fourth Circuit found that the availability of relief under the FTCA does not automatically foreclose a *Bivens* action. *Dunbar Corp v. Lindsey*, 905 F.2d 754, 762 (4th Cir. 1990). The Court pointed out other distinctions between FTCA and *Bivens* actions in *Dunbar Corp.*: (1) only compensatory damages are available in FTCA actions, whereas compensatory and punitive damages are available under *Bivens* and (2) FTCA claims must be tried to the Court, whereas *Bivens* claims may be tried to a jury. *Id.*

n. 7 (4th Cir. 1999).

The Eighth Amendment protects against the infliction of “cruel and unusual punishments.” As a general matter, prohibited punishments include those which “involve the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain.” Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 103, 97 S.Ct. 285, 290, 50 L.Ed.2d 251 (1976)(quoting Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 173, 96 S.Ct. 2909, 2925, 49 L.Ed.2d 859 (1976)). “It not only outlaws excessive sentences but also protects inmates from inhumane treatment and conditions while imprisoned.” Williams v. Benjamin, 77 F.3d 756, 761 (4th Cir. 1996). Thus, under the Eighth Amendment, sentenced prisoners are entitled to “adequate food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, medical care and personal safety.” Wolfish v. Levi, 573 F.2d 118, 125 (2d Cir. 1978), rev’d on other grounds, Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520, 99 S.Ct. 1861, 60 L.Ed.2d 447 (1979). See also Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 832, 114 S.Ct. 1970, 1976, 128 L.Ed.2d 811 (1994)(Supreme Court noted that Eighth Amendment imposes certain duties upon prison officials to “ensure that inmates receive adequate food, clothing, shelter and medical care, and must ‘take reasonable measures to guarantee the safety of the inmates.’”), quoting Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 526 - 27, 104 S.Ct. 3194, 3200, 82 L.Ed.2d 393 (1984)); Rhodes v. Chapman, 452 U.S. 337, 347, 101 S.Ct. 2392, 2399, 69 L.Ed.2d 59 (1981)(Court held that only those conditions depriving inmates of “the minimal civilized measure of life’s necessities” are sufficiently grave to form the basis of an Eighth Amendment violation). The Eighth Amendment “does not mandate comfortable prisons.” Rhodes v. Chapman, 452 U.S. at 349, 101 S.Ct. at 2400. “To the extent that such conditions are restrictive and even harsh, they are part of the penalty that criminal offenders pay for their offenses against society.” Id. at 347, 101 S.Ct. at 2399; Shakka v. Smith, 71 F.3d 162, 166 (4th Cir. 1995), citing Hudson v. McMillian, 503 U.S. 1, 9, 112 S.Ct. 995, 117 L.Ed.2d 156 (1992); Lopez v.

Robinson, 914 F.2d 486, 490 (4th Cir. 1990). To establish a violation of the Eighth Amendment in the context of a challenge to conditions of confinement, an inmate must allege (1) a “sufficiently serious” deprivation under an objective standard and (2) that prison officials acted with “deliberate indifference” to the inmate’s health and safety under a subjective standard. Wilson v. Seiter, 501 U.S. 294, 297-99, 111 S.Ct. 2321, 2323 - 2325, 115 L.Ed.2d 271 (1991). A sufficiently serious deprivation occurs when “a prison official’s act or omission . . . result[s] in the denial of the minimal civilized measure of life’s necessities.” Id. at 298, 111 S.Ct. 2321 (citing Rhodes v. Chapman, 452 U.S. at 347, 101 S.Ct. 2392). “In order to establish the imposition of cruel and unusual punishment, a prisoner must prove two elements – that ‘the deprivation of [a] basic human need was objectively sufficiently serious,’ and that ‘subjectively the officials act[ed] with a sufficiently culpable state of mind.’” Shakka v. Smith, 71 F.3d 162, 166 (4th Cir. 1995) (quoting Strickler v. Waters, 989 F.2d 1375, 1379 (4th Cir. 1993) (quotation omitted)). See also White v. Gregory, 1 F.3d 267, 269 (4th Cir. 1991) (“In *Strickler*, we held that a prisoner must suffer ‘serious or significant physical or mental injury’ in order to be ‘subjected to cruel and unusual punishment within the meaning of the’ Eighth Amendment.”) The touchstone is the health of the inmate. Plaintiff in this case must therefore allege in the first place and eventually establish a “sufficiently serious” deprivation of medical care and resulting “serious or significant physical or mental injury” in order to maintain and prevail upon his Eighth Amendment claim.

To establish the subjective component of deliberate indifference, an inmate must allege and prove each defendant’s consciousness of the risk of harm to the inmate. See Farmer, supra, 511 U.S. at 840, 114 S.Ct. at 1980. In particular, an inmate must establish that the prison official “knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health and safety; the official must both be aware of facts

from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference.” Farmer, supra, 511 U.S. at 837, 114 S.Ct. at 1979. An inmate may satisfy the subjective component of standard by showing that prison officials’ delay in providing medical treatment caused unnecessary pain or the worsening of his condition. Miltier v. Beorn, 896 F.2d 848, 853 (4th Cir. 1990)(“Failure to respond to an inmate’s known medical needs raises an inference that there was deliberate indifference to those needs.”); Cameron v. Sarraf, 128 F.Supp.2d 906, 911 - 912 (E.D.Va. 2000)(“Yet, it is equally clear that mere negligence or delay is not sufficient to establish deliberate indifference.”).

The allegations contained in Plaintiff’s Complaint do not present a claim of constitutional magnitude. The undersigned finds that Plaintiff’s general allegation that Defendants failed to provide medical treatment for his groin and lower back injuries is insufficient to state a claim under the Eight Amendment. An assertion of mere negligent conduct or malpractice is not enough to constitute an Eight Amendment violation. See Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327, 328, 106 S.Ct. 662, 663, 88 L.Ed.2d 662 (1986); Miltier v. Beorn, 896 F.2d 848, 852 (4th Cir. 1990). Although inmates are clearly entitled to reasonable medical care, an inmate must allege acts or omissions “sufficiently harmful to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs” to establish a claim under the Eight Amendment. Estelle, 429 U.S. at 105, 97 S.Ct. at 286. The undersigned first finds that under an objective standard, Plaintiff fails to allege a “sufficiently serious” deprivation of medical care resulting in a “serious or significant physical or mental injury.” Plaintiff merely alleges that Defendants failed to perform a physical examination upon his arrival at FCI Beckley and failed to provide medical treatment for his alleged groin and lower back injuries. Plaintiff does not allege that he was at risk of death or permanent disability, or suffered continuous severe pain due to the lack

of medical treatment. Second, Plaintiff fails to allege facts sufficient to satisfy the subjective component of deliberate indifference. To satisfy the subjective component, Plaintiff must allege each Defendant's consciousness of the risk of harm to him. See Farmer, supra, 511 U.S. at 840, 114 S.Ct. at 1980. Plaintiff, however, fails to allege that Defendants knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to his health or safety. Plaintiff does not assert that he requested "sick call" or sought medical treatment. Further, there is no indication in Plaintiff's Complaint that Defendants were aware of facts from which an inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm existed, or that Defendants drew that inference. Accordingly, the undersigned finds that Plaintiff's allegations cannot be construed to implicate a constitutional right for the violation of which relief can be granted under Bivens. Plaintiff's Complaint must therefore be dismissed.

PROPOSAL AND RECOMMENDATION


The undersigned therefore respectfully **PROPOSES** that the District Court confirm and accept the foregoing findings and **RECOMMENDS** that the District Court **DISMISS** Plaintiff's Complaint (Document No. 1.) and remove this matter from the Court's docket.

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that this "Proposed Findings and Recommendation" is hereby **FILED**, and a copy will be submitted to the Honorable United States District Judge Thomas E. Johnston. Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(B), and Rule 6(e) and 72(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Plaintiff shall have thirteen days from the date of filing of this Findings and Recommendation within which to file with the Clerk of this Court specific written objections identifying the portions of the Findings and Recommendation to which objection is made and the basis of such objection. Extension of this time period may be granted for good cause.

Failure to file written objections as set forth above shall constitute a waiver of *de novo* review by the District Court and a waiver of appellate review by the Circuit Court of Appeals. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 846 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Copies of such objections shall be served on opposing parties, Judge Johnston and this Magistrate Judge.

The Clerk of this Court is directed to file this “Proposed Findings and Recommendation” and to mail a copy of the same to Plaintiff, who is acting *pro se*.

ENTER: June 8, 2009.



R. Clarke VanDervort
United States Magistrate Judge